

Remarks

Claims 1-3, 6, 8, 10-12, 16, 20 and 21 were rejected as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,262,871 (Wilder et al.) "Wilder". Claim 1 has been amended to include subject matter similar to Claims 2 and 4, and thus Claims 2 and 4 are cancelled. Wilder does not describe windows capable of overlapping in any frame. Wilder describes a sensor (10) in which at any one time the whole array or only particular areas of array may be selected for readout at different resolutions by driving row and column decoders (12, 14) to determine which pixels and how many are to be read out (see FIG. 1, column 4, line 68, to column 5, line 2, and column 5, lines 14-22). It is submitted that in order to output overlapping areas such areas must share some pixels. However, this cannot be achieved at any one time from sensor (10), since it would require two different reads of the sensor, and as a result the overlapping areas would be read out from the sensor at different times. This is highly undesirable, especially in imaging areas containing fast moving objects. In such cases, overlapping one area with another area at a different times could destructively interfere with the object being viewed. Thus, Claim 1 along with its dependent Claims 3, 6, 8, 10-12, 16, 20, and 21 cannot be anticipated by Wilder, and withdrawal of the rejection of these Claims is requested.

Claims 4, 7, 13, 19, 22 and 23 were rejected as being unpatentable over Wilder. Claims 7, 13, and 19 depend on Claim 1. In rejecting original Claim 4, which is now in Claim 1, the Examiner stated that it would have been obvious "to allow windows to overlap when reading out multiple regions of interest to avoid losing image data due to overlapping between the regions of interest." Wilder does not describe or even suggest windows capable of overlapping in any frame. As stated above, reading out multiple overlapping regions in Wilder's design would have to occur at different times, since such multiple regions would have to share in part the same pixels, and the same pixels cannot be readout at the same time. Imaging regions at different times risks destructive interference between such regions, and thus such overlapping could lose image data. Accordingly, Wilder teaches away from overlapping multiple regions of interest. Moreover, in each reading cycle of the sensor, Wilder can select "to read out the pixel signals from pixels in different portions of the array" (see column 3, lines 12-14, and last three lines of Abstract). This again teaches away from overlapping regions in Wilder, since selecting different portions of the array precludes overlapping of such portions, which must share some pixels in common. Claim 22 has been amended to describe forming one or more high resolution windows which are capable of overlapping each other and overlapping one or more low resolution

windows. For similar reasons expressed above, Claim 22 is not described or suggested by Wilder. Thus, Claims 1 and 22 along with their respective dependent Claims 7, 13, 19, and 23 are patentable over Wilder, and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 7, 13, 19, 22 and 23 is requested.

In regard to the rejection of Claim 10 as being anticipated by Wilder, Wilder fails to show both means for controlling characteristics of imaging by a photodetector array and a computer system for sending signals to such controlling means in which window request commands are sent from the computer system to the controlling means. Mere citation to supervisory signals or instructions supplied to processor/computer (18) of Wilder does not anticipate that such are window request commands. Thus, Wilder does not anticipate Claim 10, and withdrawal of the rejection of this Claim is requested.

Claim 1 was rejected as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,196,939 (Elabd et al.) "Elabd". Elabd, like Wilder, fails to describe any windows that overlap in any frame. Therefore, Elabd does not anticipate Claim 1 and withdrawal of this rejection is requested.


Claims 5 and 9 were rejected as being unpatentable over Wilder in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,556,241 (Yoshimura et. al.) "Yoshimura". Claim 14 was rejected as being unpatentable over Wilder in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,095,212 (Kimata). Claim 15 was rejected as being unpatentable over Wilder in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,236,871 (Fossum et al.) "Fossum". Claim 18 was rejected as being unpatentable over Wilder in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,216,484 (Chao et al.) "Chao". Claims 5, 9, 14, 15, and 18 depend on Claim 1, which for reasons argued above is patentable over Wilder. Yoshimura, Kimata, Fossum, and Chao do not deal with imaging windows which are capable of overlapping. None of these references, Yoshimura, Kimata, Fossum, or Chao, either alone, or in combination with Wilder teach windows capable of overlapping of Claim 1. Accordingly, Claims 5, 9, 14, 15, and 18 are patentable over the patents relied upon by the Examiner, and withdrawal of their rejections is requested.

Claims 24-31 have been added to the Application. Claim 24 describes that when windows of Claim 1 overlap they overlap non-destructively in a frame. Claim 25 describes that the windows of Claim 1 which overlap in a frame may be of the same or different resolutions. Claim 26 describes that the controlling means of Claim 1 controls resolution of each of the windows by averaging pixels. Wilder does not overlap any windows in a frame, as stated earlier, and controls resolution by changing the number of pixels read out in an area, which is not comparable to pixel averaging (see column 5, lines 17-21 of Wilder). Claim 27 depends on

Claim 22 and, like Claim 26, also describes averaging pixels of the window. Claim 28 is an independent claim describing a system for imaging which enables overlapping of windows in a manner not shown or suggested by Wilder. Claims 29-31 depend on Claim 28.

It is believed that the Application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. A Petition for a two-month extension of time is enclosed with a check for \$574.00 to cover the petition fee and the amendment fee.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'K. LuKacher', followed by a horizontal line.

Kenneth J. LuKacher  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Registration No. 38,539

Dated: October 22, 2004

South Winton Court  
3136 Winton Road South, Suite 204  
Rochester, New York 14623  
Telephone: (585) 424-2670  
Facsimile: (585) 424-6196

Enclosures: Combined Transmittal and Petition for Extension of Time with a Check for \$574.00